REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15, 19 and 21-25 remain in the present application, of which claims 1, 7, 13 and 21 are independent. None of the claims has been amended herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15, 19 and 21-25.

Applicants appreciate the time and courtesy extended by the Examiner to applicants' attorney during the telephone interview of June 4, 2004. During the interview, applicants' attorney explained to the Examiner that the content of the amendment mailed January 20, 2004 (indicated on the Office Action as filed on January 22, 2004) was based on applicants' understanding of the telephone interview of January 16, 2004, the amendments to the proposed claims required by the Examiner during the telephone interview, and the Interview Summary and attachment faxed by the Examiner on January 16, 2004. Further, the Office Action was discussed in reference to U.S. Patent No. 5,515,077 ("Tateyama") and U.S. Patent No. 6,353,460 ("Sokawa et al."). No agreement was reached except that applicants' attorney agreed to submit the arguments presented during the telephone interview in writing.

Claims 1-15, 19 and 21-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tateyama in view of Sokawa et al. Applicants respectfully traverse because of at least the following reasons.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action states "Tateyama teaches the method of horizontally scrolling a display window to the left comprising the steps of receiving a data packet (Y0 Y1

-8-

U0 V0)(figure 28) that includes a field for a blank start pixel value (Y0 U0 V0), which indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out." Applicants do not agree with this statement as follows. The detailed arguments below were not previously presented in the amendment mailed January 20, 2004 because applicants believed that an agreement has been reached, and further arguments were not necessary.

Tateyama describes FIG. 28 as "a table showing color vectors to be read and displayed in each scroll mode according to the invention." (Col. 3, lines 26-27). Tateyama further recites that "FIG. 28 shows color vectors to be read and displayed in each scroll mode. In this table, "m," INVALID," DELAY TIMING, "+" and "-" represent (n-1)/2, no-display (transparent), delay time of the first vector factor from the read-timing, reading earlier and later, respectively." (Col. 9, lines 27-31). Applicants do not see any other description of FIG. 28 in Tateyama.

Claim 1 has been amended in the January 20, 2004 amendment for clarification to recite, in a relevant portion, "receiving a header data packet that includes a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out." (Emphasis Added)

First, applicants do not believe (Y0 Y1 U0 V0) can be considered a header data packet, as FIG. 28 is merely a table, and there is no teaching or suggestion as to whether any numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out is stored in a field of a header data packet as a blank start pixel value.

Second, even if (Y0 Y1 Y0 V0) were to be considered a header data packet, it does not by itself include a field for a blank start pixel vale, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out. By way of example, if Y0, Y1, U0 and V0 are 55, 66, 77 and 88, respectively, applicants do not see how anyone can determine the number of pixels to blank out from a packet of (55, 66, 77, 88). Therefore, applicants submit that a data packet (Y0 Y1 Y0 V0) does not include a field for a blank start pixel vale, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out.

Third, even if a packet is formed to include both (Y0 Y1 U0 V0) and (Y0 U0 V0) in a single packet, there is no way to tell how many pixels are to be blanked out if numerical values are used to replace (Y0 Y1 U0 V0) and (Y0 U0 V0). By way of example, if (Y0 Y1 U0 V0) and (Y0 U0 V0) are replaced by numerical values, and a packet consists of (55, 55, 77, 88)[1] and (55, 77, 88), there is no way to tell whether 55 in (55, 77, 88) represents Y0 or Y1 without further information. On the other hand, if a packet containing (Y0 Y1 U0 V0) and (Y0 U0 V0) is sent, since "Y0", "Y1", "U0" and "V0" are not numerical values, they do not constitute a <u>numerical value</u> that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out.

The Office Action further states "Sokawa teaches a header data packet comprising the RGB signal data (col. 16, line 51), the image data unit of one pixel is 16 bits (col. 22, line 14), the head of the <u>image data unit VSj</u>, and the tail of the image

---

[1] In other words, the numerical value for Y0 is identical to the numerical value for Y1 in this case. They are both 55.

-10-

data unit of the former half Vsi (fig. 22, col. 28, lines 25-27)." Sokawa et al. recites: "[f]or example, the RGB signal output from the NTSC decoder 1015 (FIG. 1) is input into the video signal input terminal 1101" (Col. 16, line 51); "the image data unit of one pixel is 16 bits, for example, and this memory capacity is divided into two portions" (Col. 22, line 14); and "the head of the image data unit of the latter half VS_j comes in contact with the tail of the image data unit of the former half Vs_i, so that the processing image data having n(1600) pixels per line which is the same as the original input image data VS is obtained." (Col. 28, lines 25-27).

As applicants' attorney presented to the Examiner during the telephone interview of June 4, 2004, applicants do not see any relationship between the above-referenced sections and FIG. 28 of Sokawa et al. and "receiving a header data packet that includes a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out." Applicants respectfully request a guidance from the Examiner as to why the cited sections of Sokawa et al. are relevant to <u>receiving a header data packet that includes a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out</u>.

In responding to the amendment mailed January 20, 2004, the Office Action states "[t]his argument is not persuasive because Tateyama teaches the claimed limitation "a <u>head</u> data packet" (see fig. 28)." However, as discussed above, FIG. 28 of Tateyama is merely a table. Applicants do not see any indication in Tateyama that any of the quantities in the table

of FIG. 28 is for inclusion in <u>a header data packet that</u> <u>includes a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a</u> <u>numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked</u> <u>out</u>

In addition, the Office Action states "Sakawa teaches Referring to fig. 7 and fig. 22 input section 2040 <u>receiving</u> is configured to be able to receive up to two sets of 16 bit digital video signals . . . The <u>head of the image data unit</u> is the later half VSj (col. 28, lines 25-26). Once the first input buffer portion is filled with the input image data, the write pointer Pw points to the head address of the second (right) input buffer portion which is <u>vacant</u> (col. 22, lines 23-25). That means <u>blanking out</u> one or more pixels start at the address (0) of the address where the read pointer P_R points (see fig. 12C). <u>A read pointer</u> P_R points to the head address of the first input buffer portion, starting the read of the input image data from the first input buffer portion (fig. 12B, col. 22, lines 27-31)." Applicants still do not see in the above referenced section any teaching or suggestion of "receiving a header data packet that includes a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out." A guidance from the Examiner is requested.

The Office Action further states "[t]hese arguments are not persuasive because packet header defines in Microsoft Computer Dictionary, fourth edition, the portion of a data packet that precedes the body(data). The header contain data such as source and destination addresses, and control and timing information, that is needed for successful transmission. Therefore, the

-12-

combined teaching of Tateyama and Sokawa meet the claimed limitation "the header data packet"."

Applicants submit that "the header data packet" in the present application is not identical to "a header of a packet" which is used for data communications, and typically include source and destination addresses. By way of example, as the applicants' attorney presented to the Examiner during the telephone interview of June 4, 2004, a header data packet is described, for example, on pages 37, line 14 through page 40, line 12 of the specification as filed in the present application.

In particular, Table 2 on page 37 and Table 3 on page 39 show the fields of the header data packet, including the "Blank Pixel Count" field, which can be used to store a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out. Of course, the claims of the present application would cover receiving a header data packet having a format different from Tables 2 and 3 as long as they include a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out, or any equivalents thereof.

In view of the above, applicants submit that Tateyama, Sokawa et al. and Microsoft Computer Dictionary, fourth edition, individually or together in any combination, do not teach or suggest "[a] method of horizontally scrolling a display window to the left comprising the steps of: receiving a header data packet that includes a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to

-13-

be blanked out" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and that it be allowed.

Since claims 2-6,and 25 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of claim 1 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claims 2-6 and 25 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

In particular, claim 25 recites "receiving a header data packet comprises receiving a plurality of data packets including the header packet and a plurality of graphics data packets, <u>each of the plurality of data packets comprising a second field indicating whether it is the header data packet or one of the plurality of graphics data packets</u>, wherein the plurality of graphics data packets contain the graphics data." (<u>Emphasis Added</u>).

In rejecting claim 25, the Office Action does not address "a second field indicating whether it is the header data packet or one of the plurality of graphics data packets." The Office Action merely states "Sokawa teaches a header data packet comprising the RGB signal data (col. 16, line 51), the image data unit of one pixel is 16 bits (col. 22, line 14), the head of the <u>image data unit VSj</u>, and the tail of the image data unit of the former half Vsi (fig. 22, col. 28, lines 25-27)" which do not appear to applicants to show the claimed limitations of claim 25.

-14-

Claim 7 recites, in a relevant portion, "receiving a header data packet that includes a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out." Claims 13 and 21 each recite, in a relevant portion, "a window controller for transmitting a header data packet to the display engine, the header data packet including a field for a blank start pixel value, which is a numerical value that indicates a number of pixels to be blanked out." For reasons similar to those state above in reference to claim 1, applicants request that the rejection of claims 7, 13 and 21 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

Since claims 8-12, 14, 15, 19 and 22-24 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 7, 13 and 21 respectively, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of claim 7, 13 or 21, in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claims 8-12, 14, 15, 19 and 22-24 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

In view of the forgoing remarks, applicants respectfully request an early issuance of a patent with claims 1-15, 19 and 21-25. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By _____
Jun-Young E. Jeon
Reg. No. 43,693
626/795-9900

JEJ/vdw
JEJ PAS563159.1-*-06/5/04 11:37 AM